

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 325

HE 014 783

TITLE Partnerships with Business and the Professions. 1981
Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 3.

INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education,
Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 81

NOTE 27p.; Selected papers presented at the Annual
National Conference of the American Association for
Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 1981).

AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont
Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 (\$3.50 plus
postage and handling).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *College Role; *Cooperative Education; Higher
Education; Industrial Training; Inplant Programs;
Inservice Education; *Nonschool Educational Programs;
Professional Associations; *Professional Continuing
Education; Professional Development; *School Business
Relationship; *Staff Development

IDENTIFIERS *Corporate Education

ABSTRACT

Perspectives on cooperative programs between higher education and business and professional associations are presented in three papers. In "New Frontiers for Higher Education: Business and Professions," K. Patricia Cross traces three alternatives for higher education in its relationships with other adult education providers: parallel operations, competition, or cooperation. Presently there are degree-granting corporation programs that accept nonemployees as students and inservice programs of industrial firms that accept only employees. Four models of cooperation with industry that range from industry's to higher education's control over content and teaching methods are described, and existing cooperative programs are identified. In "A Role for Colleges in Corporate Training and Development," Ernest A. Lynton describes the needs for education in the corporate sector, the types of programs currently used, and opportunities for improvement. Taking a corporate viewpoint, he argues for pedagogical and organizational changes in the university to strengthen educational partnerships with industry and discusses the benefits that will result for both corporations and higher education through improved cooperative programs. In "Partnerships in Continuing Education for Professionals," Philip N. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern consider the scope of professional continuing education, providers of professional education, different learning modes and settings, and advantages and problems of cooperative programs between higher education institutions and professional associations. Advantages include an improved association program, greater awareness of university capabilities, the generation of collegiality between association and university personnel, and improved professional competence. (SW)

Partnerships with Business and the Professions

ED0213325

**New Frontiers for Higher Education:
Business and Professions 1**
K. Patricia Cross

A Role for Colleges in Corporate Training and Development 8
Ernest A. Lynton

Partnerships in Continuing Education for Professionals 16
Philip N. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

KE 014 783

Foreword

On higher education's frontier are untapped opportunities for growth, especially in providing education to adults. However, colleges and universities are not alone on that frontier: Professional associations and corporations are rapidly expanding their programs in adult education. Rather than compete, the authors of the three papers in this monograph urge that colleges and universities attempt to establish mutually beneficial programs with these other providers.

To establish cooperative programs with business and professional associations, the authors advise that higher education institutions make changes in three areas: in their operating procedures, to allow greater flexibility in course scheduling, admissions, and administration; in their instruction, to give greater attention to the pedagogical needs of adults; and in their employment policies, to recognize the problems associated with faculty who serve as private educational consultants.

In examining the opportunities on the educational frontier, K. Patricia Cross traces three alternatives for higher education in its relationships with other adult education providers: parallel operations, competition, or cooperation. In advocat-

ing cooperation, she explores successful programs and stresses the responsibility of colleges and universities to educate students to become "discerning evaluators of their educational experiences."

Cautioning colleges that their goals and those of corporations differ, Ernest A. Lynton describes the needs for education in the corporate sector, the types of programs currently used, and opportunities for improvement. Taking a corporate viewpoint, he argues for pedagogical and organizational changes in the university to strengthen educational partnerships with industry. He discusses the benefits that will accrue to both corporations and higher education through improved cooperative programs.

Philip N. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern advocate—with varying degrees of optimism—cooperation with professional associations to provide continuing education for their members. As continuing education is, by definition, part of being a professional, there are many opportunities for higher education institutions to assist in the process. Nowlen and Stern discuss both the successful partnerships and the areas where problems and conflicts arise.

New Frontiers for Higher Education: Business and the Professions

K. Patricia Cross

Colleges and universities, industry, community organizations, and professional associations all supply education to the growing adult market. Campuses may view the other education providers as competitors or parallel operators, but partnership offers a wealth of opportunities.

The decisions to be made in the next 20 years will be among the most critical in the history of American higher education because we are genuinely faced with the possibility of new forms of education that are not simple extensions of the past. Contemplating the future has a never-ending fascination, and we are both baffled and humbled by polls that fail to predict the next President, by economic analyses that seem little better than guesswork, and by new generations of enrollment projections that start with an explanation of why the last projection was off-target. The error factor in the prediction of social phenomena lies in an endless stream of alternatives and unforeseen events. The draft and the women's movement raised college enrollments; the birth rate seems certain to lower them. Despite the uncertainty of our predictions, there are some new shapes on the educational frontier that we can be fairly sure will have an impact on higher education in the years ahead.

Almost certainly, knowledge is power on the new frontier—for individuals, organizations, and society as a whole. It is inconceivable that education will be less important tomorrow than it is today. From the ancient occupations of agriculture and fishing to the futuristic "high tech" occupations, workers will need to be better educated than ever before. Moreover, the continued expansion of education to previously unserved segments of the population is inevitable. Everyone is going to need more education—women as well as men, minorities as well as majorities, old as well as young, poor as well as rich, handicapped as well as able-bodied, hard-to-teach as well as easy-to-teach. There will be no diminution of the potential market for education and learning.

More education for more people for more years of their lives would seem to make education a growth industry. The literature and gloomy prognostications of higher education notwithstanding, education, in the broad meaning of that term, is of growing importance in the society. We have all heard it said that the railroads failed, not because there was no longer a need for their services—indeed the need for transportation was growing—but because the tunnel vision of

the railroad operators concentrated on running the railroads instead of exploring the new frontier of the transportation industry. It is sobering to observe that the management of colleges and universities is the Number One concern of higher education today. Such narrow vision could be just as fatal to colleges and universities as the preoccupation with management was to the railroads in an earlier era.

There can be no argument with the fact that the great nationwide growth and campus building that characterized the 1950s and '60s is over. At the same time, it seems clear that the number of providers of educational services and the number of people engaged in organized learning activities will continue to grow. The education industry is growing, and colleges and universities are only a part, albeit an important part, of that growth industry.

Higher education is not alone

The simple fact is that institutions of education are not alone on the education frontier of the 21st century. Industry spends not mere millions but billions of dollars annually on the education and training of employees. Last year, AT&T spent four and a half times as much on the education of its employees as M.I.T. spent on the education of its students (Luxenberg 1978-79). The American Management Associations, with an annual education budget of 50 million dollars uses 7,500 lecturers and discussion leaders to conduct 2,000 formal educational programs each year. The president of the American Management Associations was quoted recently as saying that it is "time for AMA and other non-collegiate organizations to enter into competition with schools of business in graduate

K. Patricia Cross is visiting professor at the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University. She presented this paper as the keynote address to the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C. The address also was designated the Delta Epsilon Sigma national scholastic honor society lecture for 1981.

programs." (PER Special Report 1977, pp. 7-8). The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants is already in such competition. It offers extensive professional education programs consisting of individual study and regional workshops that rival the degree-granting monopoly of higher education because the licensing boards, which determine who is licensed to practice accounting, recognize AICPA education as appropriate to professional practice.

Educational purists like to make a distinction between the "education" offered by colleges and the "training" offered by industry, but such distinctions are difficult to maintain. Non-collegiate organizations have moved into "education" almost as fast as colleges, especially community colleges, have moved into "training," and the distinction is now blurred beyond usefulness—at least when applied to providers. Colleges are heavily involved in training as well as in education; and the programs of many corporations contain as much emphasis on theory, research, and personal development as any business school.

A related blurring of educational function occurs in the distinction between credit and non-credit learning. Within commuting distance of my home near Boston are four new degree-granting programs founded by corporations—a hospital, a bank, a consulting firm, and a computer laboratory. While the image of bachelor's and master's degrees offered by non-colleges is still mildly sensational, the movement of collegiate institutions into the realm of non-credit instruction is now commonplace. Between 1968 and 1978, the number of collegiate institutions offering non-credit instruction more than doubled, until today it is the norm rather than the exception for degree-granting institutions to be involved in non-degree instruction. Most recently, it is not the community colleges but the four-year colleges that are the fastest growing providers of non-credit education (NCES 1979). Furthermore, it is increasingly easy to convert a course of study not originally pursued for credit into academic credit through credit-by-examination or credit for experiential learning.

Non-collegiate organizations have moved into "education" almost as fast as colleges, especially community colleges, have moved into "training," and the distinction is now blurred beyond usefulness—at least when applied to providers.

Granted, there is some blurring of the old distinctions between education and training and between credit and non-credit instruction. Does the liberal arts tradition of collegiate education at least have a reasonably distinct path to itself on the new frontier? I am afraid not. Television constitutes a powerful tool for teaching the humanities, history, and the arts, and both commercial and public television have devel-

oped programs that rival anything offered in some of our finest colleges.

Illustrations of the blurring of once-distinctive functions for higher education could be extended, but my point is that the education frontier is very large, and higher education is not alone out there. There are potential partners, competitors, and parallel operators. How we deal with this new phenomenon may determine the future of higher education, as well as have profound implications for the broader learning society.

Competition, cooperation, and parallelism

There are three basic ways to work with others on the new education frontier. We can compete, cooperate, or run parallel operations. In the beginning, the relationship between collegiate institutions and other providers of education services was essentially parallel. Colleges taught the classics, textile mills taught weaving, and butcher shops taught butchering. Each went its own way along well-defined paths. Many educators act as though parallelism still predominates. Plodding along their own path, they keep pretty much to themselves, quite unaware of travelers on other pathways. Occasionally, they are startled to see others on what they thought was their pathway, and the question arises as to whether they should continue on as though nothing had happened, try to push the others off the path, or stop and have a conversation about where they are going and how best to get there.

It will be increasingly difficult to remain unaware of the traffic on the new frontier for two reasons. The first is that the most promising new market for educational services from now until the end of the century will be adult learners who are thrown constantly into contact with many education providers, among them employers, professional associations, unions, and community groups. Because these providers are competing for roughly the same market, it is going to be almost impossible to remain as unaware of one another's services as in the past.

The second reason for the gradual disappearance of a blissful ignorance of other education providers is the recent emphasis on informing consumers about their options. The federal government supports education information activities in each state; brokerage and advising services for adult learners are springing up everywhere; computers are crammed full of a wide variety of education options; and finally, education competitors themselves are mailing brochures and advertising in newspapers and on radio and television. If, through some extraordinary concentration, academics manage to remain unaware of all of this activity on the new frontier, coordinating boards and state legislatures, who are generally unsympathetic to the unnecessary duplication of education services, will call it to their attention. And so, the mode of unaware parallelism as an approach to getting along with others on the new frontier is rapidly disappearing as an option.

There is another kind of parallelism, however, that will

probably increase in the years ahead. It is the model in which each provider performs a unique function within well-defined boundaries. I referred earlier to the parallelism of the past in which colleges taught classics and textile mills taught weaving. Such sharply prescribed paths never meet because they have different functions and different markets. Trustees, coordinating boards, and legislatures endorse this form of parallelism, believing that differentiation of function will result in greater efficiency. And entrepreneurs from education, business, and government interested in launching education programs look for the unique service that is not being performed by anyone else. In the jargon of the trade, this is known as seeking the "market niche" which means simply that providers who are potentially competitive will seek the unique service where competition is weak or nonexistent.

The new Wang Institute near Boston, for example, started a master's degree in software engineering in the backyard of quite a number of engineering colleges without any apparent nervousness on the part of those colleges. Although it should be noted that this fall M.I.T. launched its first part-time master's degree program for engineers and computer scientists working in Boston's high-technology industries, which shows among other things that finding a neat market niche offers no permanent security against competition.

Indeed, higher education harbors some of the fiercest competitors within its own broadly-defined mission. Colleges that thought they had established a market niche in their own region have been astounded to find a satellite campus from an institution hundreds or even thousands of miles away on what they thought was their turf. There are situations too when external events force a merger of once independent paths. The University of California, for example, has a legislatively-defined market niche, which is to serve the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates and to distribute their upper-division/lower-division students in a 60:40 ratio. For years, the universities and the community colleges got along compatibly on their well-defined paths with the community colleges concentrating on the freshmen/sophomore years and sending transfers to the universities for upper-division work. In 1979, 85 percent of all students entering public colleges in California entered community colleges. (California Postsecondary Education Commission 1980).

Within the last five years, however, student enrollments in the community colleges have shifted dramatically away from transfer curricula toward vocational programs. The result is that there are no longer enough transfer students to supply the universities, and the university finds itself almost suddenly with a 50:50 ratio of upper-division to lower-division students. That places the community colleges and the universities in unaccustomed competition. There are several options. The community colleges could reemphasize their transfer function, beefing up liberal arts courses, recruiting able high school seniors, and in general reasserting one of their old roles of providing transfers to the universities. Or the community colleges could place greater emphasis on their mission of

local community service, concentrating largely on vocational education and continuing education for adults. There are also actions that could be taken by others to alleviate the competition. The university, for example, could refuse to admit more freshmen, thereby forcing some of the better students back into the community colleges for their lower-division work, and in so doing reinforce the transfer function of the community colleges. Or the coordinating board and the legislature could decide that, in the interest of the people of the state, some new division of labor should be worked out between the university and the community colleges.

The point is that life on the new frontier is of necessity going to be more interactive for education providers. Formerly parallel paths are already merging and intersecting and in general behaving in thoroughly unparallel ways.

Parallelism can be maintained only through conscious and sustained effort and by careful definition of non-overlapping functions. While parallelism is still possible on the near frontier, it calls for a narrowing of function and a steadfast refusal to be seduced by attractive opportunities. Colleges could, for example, reduce overlap with two large competitors, professional associations and industry, by returning to the liberal arts tradition. To do so, however, involves risks that few colleges are willing to take. The new adult clientele, it turns out, are just as career-minded as younger students, and despite recent collegiate attention to general education, students are placing more emphasis, not less, on vocational goals. Many formerly "pure" liberal arts colleges are instituting programs in business administration and allied health services as fast as conditions permit. I see few signs that colleges have any intention of reducing potential overlap through narrowing the scope of their functions.

A few examples of the options

So let us turn now to an exploration of competition and cooperation on the new frontier. First, we need to know who is out there doing what. There is good reason to question the best data that we have about education providers because we have not yet developed the broad picture of education in the society. The data are, at best, educated guesses. It seems reasonably clear, however, that the big four in postsecondary education are colleges and universities, community organizations, private industry, and professional associations, in that order (Peterson 1979). Which providers overlap with one another will depend on institutional missions. The programs of the professional associations and those designed by industry for executives and middle management, for example, have high potential for cooperation and competition, with professional schools of colleges and universities. Community colleges may find themselves in competition with adult schools, proprietary schools, a variety of community agencies, and of course, four-year colleges that are becoming open-admissions institutions.

Since the frontier is too vast to explore here, let me select

a few examples that are representative of the type of activity that we might find today, examining each for its potential for cooperation or competition.

First, there are the degree-granting corporation programs, which on the surface seem to offer the greatest potential competition because they are invading the credentialing monopoly of higher education. I believe, however, that they offer only the mildest possibility for competition. Such programs usually are geared to a narrow market niche, and they are and no doubt will continue to be very small. Arthur D. Little, for example, offers a master's of science in management designed primarily for experienced overseas managers. It is an 11-month, full time, residential program. In its current class of 67 students, 65 are from foreign countries. The Wang Institute offers the unique master's of software engineering, and the recognized need for such training seems to have made them a welcome addition to the high-tech community along Boston's Route 128. Planners for Wang's future envision a full-time equivalent enrollment of 100 students four or five years from now. The new Institute of Health Professions at Massachusetts General Hospital is somewhat more threatening because it overlaps traditional health curricula and because it projects an enrollment of 300 to 400 students over the next decade.*

Quite significantly, I think, all of these new degree-granting institutes explored, and some even tried cooperative arrangements with higher education before starting their own programs. Their complaints were several.

First, the multidisciplinary emphases desired in the new programs were hard to introduce into traditional university programs, and rigid compartmentalization of academic departments slowed down decisions and made teamwork difficult.

Second, there was the difficulty of coping with certain academic rigidities. One corporate dean commented, for example, that he extended the length of an economics course on the spot when he and the teacher agreed that the typical 13-week semester was not long enough to cover the essential material.

Finally, students complained that the coursework at the colleges was too theoretical and removed from reality, and they preferred to spend their time with working professionals.

Theoretically, the new degree-granting institutions are competitive with higher education. Despite the efforts of most such programs to get along peaceably on the new frontier, the fact is that they are doing the same thing higher education is doing—providing instruction and granting degrees useful for upward career mobility. Practically, their degree-granting authority may be less important than the principle of profit-making corporations establishing or operating teaching institutions. Degrees are not really essential for job mobility; it is only essential that the learning be recognized by employers

and potential employers. And employers can recognize any learning they consider relevant. By definition, programs sponsored by employers and professional associations are highly relevant to people's careers. In fact, for the average adult there is probably nothing as relevant to upward job mobility as non-credit employer-managed programs.

Unlike corporation-founded degree programs, which accept non-employees as students, the in-service programs of hundreds of industrial firms throughout the country provide education and training only for their own employees. Like the degree programs, however, many of them tried cooperation with higher education before making the decision to establish their own education facilities.

Degrees are not really essential for job mobility; it is only essential that the learning be recognized by employers and potential employers. And employers can recognize any learning they consider relevant.

New England Telephone Company does not offer degrees to employees pursuing studies at its elegant learning center in Marlboro, Massachusetts, but during the third quarter of 1980 more than 9,000 employees attended classes at the center in the expectation of employer recognition and reward. The learning center contains 35 classrooms, a resource center with a specialized library, a microfiche collection, journals, audiovisual materials, and access to computerized data bases; it also features a dormitory with private baths, television, and telephones, a handsome dining room, and a lounge that turns into a cocktail lounge after 5 p.m. The center has lavish facilities for course development, course support, and the production of curricular materials, and classrooms have built-in facilities for use of the new technology. There are 200 courses listed for 1980, and 90 percent of the instruction is provided by New England Telephone Company staff.*

Why should New England Telephone invest so much money and effort in education? There are many reasons for the spectacular growth of company-based education. Among them the need for new skills, higher-level skills, and in general a more intellectually competent work force. But educators might usefully ponder the motivation behind the exploding growth of curricular and instructional specialists in industry. The American Society for Training and Development, a professional association for educators and trainers in industry, has doubled its membership over the past decade, and it is fairly clear that industry is developing its own educational expertise. Lusterman's 1977 study of education in industry reported that only 12 percent of top business executives

* Information on non-collegiate degrees provided by Linda Eisenmann, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

* Information on employer training programs provided by Robert Hahn, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

think schools and colleges do a good or excellent job of preparing people for work. Eighty percent felt that some of industry's teaching methods could be advantageously adopted or put to wider use by educational institutions. Among these were greater emphasis on student involvement; tailoring of methods, course length, and course curriculum to individual needs; and increased use of instructional technologies.

What is hard to take about that list of suggestions from fellow travelers on the new frontier is that criticism is directed toward our area of presumed expertise—teaching. Our own, possibly naive, notion of cooperation with industry is that they should provide the money, released time for employees and new and expensive equipment, and we will provide the instruction. That kind of marriage, while fairly common now, appears shaky as a future model for cooperation. Employers may conclude that their teaching is as good or better than ours and question the need for an alliance.

Some view the rise of education in industry as fairly irrelevant to higher education on the grounds that "training" is quite different task from "education," while others see industrial training programs as directly competitive on the grounds that most education today must be sold to students as job-relevant. Since I view isolation from the world of work as dangerous and competition as foolish, let me direct my attention to an exploration of cooperation on the new frontier.

Four models of cooperation

There are presently four models of cooperation with industry, and they lie on a continuum ranging from industry's control over what is taught and how, to higher education's control over these traditional functions. In the model worked out by John Wood Community College and Harris Corporation in Illinois, the corporation provides technical instruction, physical facilities, and a million dollars' worth of advanced equipment. The college provides administrative services, counseling, social facilities, and remedial education if needed. A contract with a private four-year liberal arts college education in the area provides general and liberal education. In this "common market" model, the college becomes, in the words of its president, "a manager of the total learning process, diagnosing and analyzing community and student needs, then determining which contractual delivery system can provide the most efficient and effective means of educating the students." (Heath and Peterson, n.d., p. 7). The important feature of this model is that the college has determined that Harris Corporation can provide the best technical instruction in broadcast electronics technology, and thus Harris employees are teaching courses for college credit in this concentration. Other local providers, including John Wood, offer instruction in other majors.

By all numerical measures, John Wood Community College appears to be a successful educational enterprise on the new frontier. They claim that their common market concept

"has expanded educational programs, reduced 'turf' conflicts, and avoided program duplication while reducing costs." (Heath and Peterson, n.d., p. 1). Enrollment has increased ten-fold in four years. Students may choose from ten different majors. Between 84 and 92 percent of the students complete their courses each term, and instructional costs are well below the statewide average for community colleges.

While it is hard to argue with success, it is easy for many academics to argue with the basic premises of the common market model. Some contend that John Wood has been pushed off the main path of providing college instruction and is now meandering the byways of administrative services. That, the traditional academic would contend, is no way to run a college.

But is that the question? Or is the question how much can such a cooperative model contribute to education in this society? If that is the question, how important is academic autonomy to the education of the nation? Is it desirable for college faculty to award credit for a program of instruction that they neither provide nor control? That question, of course, is surfacing everywhere as higher education scans the new frontier for potential partners. The majority of colleges and universities already grant credit for lessons that they did not teach—through advanced placement, credit by examination, transfer from other institutions, recommendations from the American Council on Education's Office of Educational Credit, and most recently, credit for "experiential learning." In all of those instances, faculty retain the right to determine which skills and knowledge are creditable by their institutions. The new wrinkle seems to be how much authority higher education can afford to give up in the interest of new cooperative arrangements. What are the principles involved in these new departures? The answers are not easy, and they are especially difficult for educators who prize academic autonomy above all else.

A second model of college/industry cooperation also raises questions. In some states, South Carolina for example, the governor has promised "to prepare to industry's quality specifications and lead time," a work force with the necessary job skills for new industries coming into the state or for old ones expanding their businesses (Garrison 1980, p. 21). Sometimes credit goes with the instruction and sometimes not in these new "employer-specific" models, but credit *per se* seems a less significant departure from tradition than the principle that industry is playing a powerful role in curriculum development to the apparent satisfaction and benefit of everyone concerned. Who can argue with a coalition that makes legislators happy because it brings industrial growth to the state and reduces unemployment, makes students happy because they are prepared for jobs that actually exist, and makes colleges and faculty members happy because they are receiving funding? Moreover, it appears that if the mission of community colleges is to serve the needs of the local community (Gleazer 1980), employer-specific programs are consistent with that mission. Yet traditional academics, to the extent

that they are aware of such programs at all, are disturbed that such a strong bond with particular industries will compromise the independence of education. Philosophically and practically, this type of cooperation raises questions about the proper role of colleges on the new frontier.

On the philosophical level, there is the issue of the preservation of academic independence for the greater and broader good of society. What's good for General Motors may not be good for the country. Putting colleges under pressure to produce to the specifications of industry is extolled by advocates of greater responsiveness and condemned by critics supporting traditional academic integrity. On the practical level, there is a Catch 22. If higher education gears itself to consumer demand, whether the demand comes from students, industry, or the governor, we enter into competition with anyone else who sets out to please the consumer; if we don't respond to consumer demand, we give it away to those who do. The American Council of Life Insurance sponsors the forward-looking Trend Analysis Program. One of the questions raised by futurists in the insurance business is whether life insurance companies should "give closer consideration to investing in agencies, institutions, and technology employed in orienting, retraining, and placing workers in new jobs or careers" (p. 19). That, among other things, is what higher education thought it was doing in its new enthusiasm for lifelong learning. The practical question is, if we get into the competition of selling in the open marketplace, can we demonstrate the superiority of our product? If, on the other hand, we remain aloof from responding to consumer demand, will more responsive agencies corner the market?

The third model of cooperation between the world of work and the world of education is the seemingly problem-free advisory board model used successfully by every level of higher education from community colleges to graduate and professional schools. In this model, the college department listens carefully to the advice from industry, but gives its own way in making all final decisions pertaining to curriculum and instruction. There are so many of these models around that you can each look to your own institution for examples.

Are there any problems on the new frontier with these models? The problem that such loose arrangements may not offer a strong enough voice to industry. Earlier, I referred to the efforts of corporations to cooperate with colleges before establishing their own programs. In many cases, colleges proved either unable or unwilling to implement the advice received, and the corporations decided it was easier to establish their own programs. Some switched roles and put the academics on the advisory boards, concluding perhaps that academics are better at giving advice than taking it. If the advisory board model is to work, it appears that there must be an equal partnership in which we make clear to ourselves and to industry that we are not interested in industry just for its money. Marrying for money seems to work best when the poor partner is so witty, beautiful, prestigious, or otherwise desirable that the rich partner is willing to be loved for money

alone. There was a time when there was prestige in being associated with academe, but that seems less the case in the immediate future unless higher education can reestablish its national esteem. The advisory board model probably will work only as long as authority is truly shared and mutual trust and respect pervade the negotiations.

Finally, there is the education/industry model left over from the old frontier, which is the most prevalent of all today. That is the parallel mode in which higher education does its job and industry does its job, and communication and cooperation are sometime things. That sounds comfortable, after all of the problems we can foresee in the other models. It might even work if higher education could define its role independent of the jobs that are primary motivations for students attending college, and if industry could define its training function independent of the education that workers bring to the job.

Establishing partnerships

Hard as it may be to do, establishing mutually supportive partnerships with industry seems to me an essential task on the new frontier. Higher education has much to learn about being a good partner. Reducing potential industrial partners to the status of junior partners whose task it is to offer support without criticism is not likely to result in a constructive or lasting relationship. Neither is selling our soul for a mess of short-range benefits. But establishing partnerships based on mutual trust and respect and a careful consideration of what each has to offer is a pathway that seems clearly indicated on the new frontier. The potential partners are many, and some colleges are well along the road to forging promising new partnerships.

Miami-Dade Community College, to cite but one example, has found a way to develop multiple partnerships with industry, other colleges, television and film producers, and publishers through the development of telecourses, development that is too expensive for the college to undertake independently. While implementation is difficult and may take years, the idea is simple.

Miami-Dade (1978) reasoned that they could use their faculties and expertise in course design to produce print and audiovisual course materials of sufficiently high quality to be attractive to many providers on the new frontier. They decided to concentrate first on high-volume required collegiate courses. The potential audience for such telecourses is high—far greater than even Miami-Dade's 58,000 students—and resistance is minimal when such courses are offered as support for classroom instruction. The innovators at Miami-Dade soon learned that with such high volume, they could command sufficient attention from publishers and the television and film industry to have materials developed to their specifications. Miami-Dade and seven other community colleges now form a telecourse producers' consortium, and they will be working with a users' consortium of hundreds of col-

leges that will provide guidance as to what is needed by colleges throughout the country.

Ultimately, such ambitious cooperative projects will stand or fall on the quality of the work. Unlike college courses taught behind closed classroom doors, telecourses are out there for the whole world to see and to judge. The adoption of a telecourse for college credit undergoes stringent evaluation by college faculties. If a product is shoddy or not well-conceived, it will fail in the marketplace.

The issue of quality

What has been introduced here is the issue of quality. Educators need not fear competition as long as quality is recognizable. That means, of course, the quality must be present in the curriculum and instruction of higher education; it also means that it must be recognized by potential learners. This though involves the always troublesome question of whether consumers can be trusted to demand quality. Do consumers know quality when they vote for or against taxes, or spend money for courses, or give valuable time to instructional programs? If not, it appears that we as educators have largely ourselves to blame. The educational system has had a virtual monopoly on students for 12 to 16 years. If, in that time, we have done little to help students become discerning evaluators of their educational experiences, then we have failed in one of the most significant tasks of education in the learning society.

I am convinced that as educators we do not do a very good job of preparing undergraduates for their future as lifelong learners. . . . What are we doing to prepare them for the choices in education and learning experience that they will have to make? Will they know the difference between quality education and fraud?

I am convinced that as educators we do not do a very good job of preparing undergraduates for their future as lifelong learners. Clearly, students in college today are going to be offered unparalleled opportunities for intellectual, personal, professional, and interpersonal development through education. What are we doing to prepare them for the choices in education and learning experiences that they will have to make? Will they know the difference between quality education and fraud? We have only started to scratch the surface of offering students experience in evaluating their own education. Most colleges—some conscientiously, some with only symbolic compliance—now ask students to evaluate college courses. There is, however, rarely any effort to educate students for their roles as evaluators, and emphasis

is far more likely to be on evaluating the performance of the instructor than on increasing self-awareness of the quality of the student's learning experience.

Even less attention has been given to helping students formulate educational goals. Very few colleges have followed the lead of Empire State College and other so-called "non-traditional" colleges in helping students to negotiate a learning contract that requires students to become sophisticated, knowledgeable evaluators of how various educational options will meet their particular needs.

There is, I suppose, some risk involved in making students discerning consumers. They will choose the educational services that best meet their goals. If competition lies on the new frontier, most academics would agree, I think, that quality is higher education's most important attribute. Thus, quality must be safeguarded against hucksters in and out of the education establishment, and all of our students, whenever they study with us, must be educated to recognize quality when they make their choices.

In this overview, I have tried to explore some limited aspects of the new frontier. I cited a few examples of the many partnerships that are being formed almost daily. Not all partnerships established in these exciting years will be either lasting or desirable. It is highly probable, however, that for the remaining years of this century, marriages between providers of lifelong learning options will outnumber divorces.

References

- California Postsecondary Education Commission. "Opening Enrollments for Fall 1979 in California Colleges and Universities." Sacramento: July 1980.
- Garrison, Don C. "Community Colleges and Industry: A Stronger Partnership for Human Resources Development." in Roger Yarrington, (ed. *Employee Training for Productivity*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.
- Heath, Paul R. and Peterson, Susan L. *The Common Market Concept: Contracting for Community-Based Educational Services*. Stockton, California: COMBASE, n.d.
- Lusterman, Seymour. *Education in Industry*. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.
- Luxenberg, S., "Education at AT&T" *Change*, 10 (December/January 1978-79): 26-35.
- Miami-Dade Community College District Board of Trustees Report, "The Development of Instructional Technology at Miami-Dade Community College." May 8, 1978.
- National Center for Education Statistics, News Release, August 6, 1979.
- PER Special Reports on Continuing Education: Institutions and Programs. Postsecondary Education Resources, Inc., Vol. 1, No. 1, August 1977.
- Peterson, R.E., and Associates. *Lifelong Learning in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Tap Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Life Insurance, n.d.

A Role for Colleges in Corporate Training and Development

Ernest A. Lynton

Although corporations and colleges operate with different goals, they can work together to meet the goals of each—increasing productivity and providing workers with a broader education. Doing so demands organizational and pedagogical changes for both.

Any attempt to explore ways of enhancing the collaboration between educational institutions and the corporate world in the training and development of employees must begin with a recognition of the basic distinctions between the goals and purposes of each sector.

Corporations—and all employers, including those in government and in non-profit agencies—are primarily interested in the cost-effective operation of their enterprise. They will support the development and the renewal of employee skills only to the extent to which this appears to be a valid and necessary means toward that end. Participants in training programs are chosen on the basis of corporate priorities, not individual needs, and by the same token, format and content of the programs are tailored so as to produce immediate and tangible returns.

By contrast, colleges and universities exist to foster individual development, and this is an end in itself. Students are admitted on the basis of who is most likely to need and to profit from the educational program. The curriculum is designed, at least in principle, to bring about the greatest long-range enhancement of the individual.

These differences are inherent and legitimate, and must be kept in mind in the development of partnerships across the new frontier. The question, then, is what partnerships are possible and mutually beneficial within the context of the different purposes and priorities of the two sectors.

The answer would seem to depend strongly on the extent to which employers envision, either as a positive development or as an unavoidable liability, an increasing stability and permanence of their labor force at all levels. Many signs point towards a growing acceptance of this, particularly in larger enterprises (see, for example, *Engineering News* 1979). It is reflected in the title change that has made many personnel managers into human resource managers. This implies that the workforce indeed constitutes a long-term investment that needs to be maintained, and occasionally refurbished and renovated much like a company's physical resources (Hodgkinson 1981). A superficial study such as this cannot deter-

mine to what extent this is a view widely accepted with top management and whether U.S. industry has really moved substantially from "hire what you need" to "train what you need" when internal and external changes require new skills and knowledge. Such a move would mean that internal human resource development becomes an integral part of corporate long-range strategic planning, and would justify moving beyond immediate, task-oriented training to include more emphasis on basic concepts. Corporate self-interest would be served by combining education about the "why" with the training of the "how."

Two additional factors appear to be of substantial importance. One is the rise in internal organizational complexity and interrelationships within companies of even moderate size, particularly those involved in high technology. Close co-operation must exist among different components of research and development and between them and marketing, financing, and other management areas. The need for horizontal as well vertical relationships has been termed "matrix management." (Janger 1979.) It places considerable demands on supervisors and managers to maintain organizational effectiveness and emerges as one of the principal forces in shaping the content and direction of corporate education and training, as will be further discussed below.

A second factor is "the quality of worklife" (Craig and Evers 1981; Bentley and Hansen 1980). This issue has received much attention with regard to the manual labor force but apparently less at the supervisory and managerial level. At all levels there appears to be a decrease in job satisfaction, primarily because of two concurrent but countervailing trends. On the one hand there has been a rapid rise in the educational level of employees at all levels; the national aver-

Ernest A. Lynton is commonwealth professor at the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest, University of Massachusetts. He prepared this paper for publication in Current Issues in Higher Education. The research for the paper was supported by the Ford Foundation.

age for clerical workers, for example, is 14.4 years of education. (Bureau of Labor Statistics 1981.) At the same time there are indications that even at the professional and managerial level work has not become more interesting and challenging; in fact, it may have become more routine. Coupled with limited upward mobility as the hierarchical pyramid becomes saturated, this combination can result—and according to some sources has resulted—in substantial decrease in job satisfaction.

The current concern about the decline in productivity (Denison 1974, 1979; Kendrick 1977), is likely to trigger increasing discussion as to whether this is due primarily to inadequately updated skills, to declining organizational effectiveness, or to decreasing job satisfaction. In view of the fact that a primary goal and justification for corporate expenditures for training and development is to increase productivity and profitability, the nature and content of these activities will be strongly influenced by the outcome of this discussion.

Categories of programs

The first major study of corporate education by Lusterman (1977) groups the purposes into three broad categories:

1. to accommodate the growth and turnover in personnel,
2. to meet education and training needs created by changes in the knowledge and skills required by, or available to, a company and its employees,
3. to improve the skills and performance of present employees in their present jobs.

1. The principal need arising from growing numbers of employees and from their natural and inevitable turnover is to prepare individuals for effective entry into first-level professional, supervisory, and managerial positions. This entry typically occurs from one of three sources: promotion from a so-called non-exempt job into supervisory or professional positions; "diagonal" movement from a professional into a supervisory position; initial entry, usually after college graduation.

It is understandable that a certain amount of instruction is needed for individuals in the first two of these three groups. They are moving into activities for which, in general, they have not had prior preparation. Inasmuch as both the demand for and content of such courses are fairly easily determined, it is surprising how few colleges and universities have moved to provide appropriate programs. There are only a small number of short courses and workshops for newly appointed foremen and supervisors, and there are even fewer college offerings for engineers and other professional personnel who are assuming supervisory and managerial duties. As a result, most of this instruction is provided by the companies either with their own training and development staff or through consultants.

Even more striking is the current situation with regard to new hires of college graduates. Clearly each company needs to provide some initial orientation to its specific products and

procedures, but to a disconcerting extent, corporate executives feel that college graduates are improperly and inadequately prepared and companies are forced to provide what might be called remedial instruction.

It should come as no surprise that corporations are very dissatisfied with the ability of college graduates to communicate effectively, and on the whole employers find the problem as intractable as do most colleges and universities. But a second category of basic skills receives even more complaints: With almost complete unanimity, corporate officials feel that college graduates are inadequately or not at all prepared to deal with organizational and interpersonal relationships. Thus there is great stress on human interaction and organizational effectiveness in the entry-level orientation and training programs. These programs typically consist of one or two weeks of intensive instruction. Large companies usually have both the facilities and the staff to provide this repeatedly throughout the year. Small enterprises frequently turn to programs conducted by the American Management Associations or other external providers.

2. A second substantial portion of corporate training is developed in response to changes in technology, products, organization, or external regulations. On the whole this is one area of training that is not predictable, must be accomplished promptly, and in all probability, is not repetitive.

Instructional activities in this category range from short briefing sessions on matters such as compliance with a new federal regulation to elaborate and complex preparations for launching of a new product. The company may prepare a whole curriculum of training materials for its sales force, service personnel, and others who will have to be familiar with the new product. A growing proportion of this material is being produced in the form of video cassettes, computerized instruction, and other formats allowing the training to take place in many locations at various times.

Also falling into this category of employer-sponsored instruction is the preparation given to individuals slated for an overseas assignment. This consists primarily of intensive language training, provided by one of the several commercial firms specializing in this, and is sometimes supplemented by a brief workshop—in some cases including the families of the employee—on cross-cultural issues. Here again, it is surprising how little involvement there is by the language and foreign-area specialists of our colleges and universities, indicating a lack of adaptability to the very different instructional formats and the locations desired by the employers.

3. Many companies also support a substantial continuing education and training effort for professionals and managers. Some of this is intended to provide individuals with opportunities for improving their work-related competence and skills and to keep them up to date with policies and procedures of the company, external issues, and the like. Most of the emphasis, however, appears to be on providing appropriate instruction at the time of, or in preparation for, continuing up-

ward movement across the several hierarchical bridge points. The larger the company, the more explicit is the distinction among programs for first-line line managers, middle managers, advanced managers, and executives.

The more advanced the level, the more use is made of existing advanced management and executive training programs conducted by business schools and other academic units throughout the country. These range from short courses to 13-week sessions, and there are directories listing and describing them (Bricker 1981; McNulty 1980; American Management Associations 1979) for the benefit of divisional managers and human resource directors responsible for the assignment of personnel to such courses. Some companies publish their own list of preferred programs for internal use.

In addition to using appropriate programs in college and universities as well as workshops and seminars organized by consulting firms and professional associations, the larger companies also have in-house programs, often as parts of elaborate, multi-year schemes in which managers on their way up alternate between in-house and external program taken at regular intervals. Limited use is made as well of tuition remission plans and, in some cases, of company-supported leaves for full-time graduate study. However, the considerable potential of tuition plans for more business/higher education cooperation has barely been scratched.

In most cases, individuals are identified for these successive stages of development at some time while they are at the preceding managerial level. Some of the largest companies, however, have recently instituted more of a long-range developmental approach, to ensure the availability of properly prepared candidates for top executive positions 10 and 20 years ahead (Shaeffer 1972). In such a "successor planning system," as it is formally called in one large corporation, strategic planning includes estimates of future needs at senior executive levels. The company then identifies a number of very junior, highly promising managers—about three times as many as ultimately needed. These individuals follow a sophisticated plan for development, combining successive periods of training and education with a series of appointments in different segments of the corporation.

Among the most elaborate programs of executive development is that at IBM. It consists, in principle, of an alternating sequence of internal and out-company programs spaced at approximately three-year intervals throughout an individual's career with the company. The sequence includes three IBM-focused executive development activities:

- a three-week Advanced Management School designed for high-potential middle managers, focusing on the company, the managerial process, and the business environment;
- a one-week Executive Seminar for executives, covering IBM's strategic issues and external economic, social, and political developments;
- a two-week International Executive Program, for senior

U.S. and foreign IBM executives, concentrating on strategic international issues facing the company.

The faculty is composed of top IBM executives and selected outside speakers. Interspersed with these internal programs are four categories of external activities:

- a General Management program, usually at a graduate business school at a major university;
- a Leadership program, concentrating on interpersonal effectiveness at the executive level, as provided, for example, at the Menninger Institute;
- a Public Affairs program, dealing with federal operations and national policy issues, for example, at the Brookings Institution or the American Enterprise Institute;
- a Humanities program, focusing on society and values, such as the Aspen Institute Executive Seminar.

It is also worth noting that IBM is one of a small but growing number of corporations providing educational allowances for a special kind of "bridge point" from one activity to another: retirement. Financial assistance is provided for pre-retirement retraining.

An academic view of corporate training

To an outside observer new to the subject, the least expected characteristic of corporate training and development is the pervasive emphasis on interpersonal relationships, human behavior, team work, and organizational development. Much of this reflects a perceived need arising from the growing organizational complexity of many modern corporations. When an individual has multiple reporting relationships, when responsibility is not always matched with authority, and when cooperation and group effort are at a premium, special demands are placed on personal behavior and relationships. To a more limited extent, the strong behavioral emphasis also reflects the growing concern with job satisfaction and personal fulfillment as contributing to productivity.

At the same time one is struck by the extent to which the approach to these issues have been professionalized into a distinct vocation of human resource and organizational development, with its own national associations, publications, meetings and, inevitably, its own jargon. This has many advantages, in that it serves to create a network of information and exchange of experience, and to translate basic theoretical concepts into practical terms and applicable programs. But there is the danger that a profession may become a closed circle, in which corporate staff and external consultants reinforce each other without much disinterested criticism, and through which valid concepts may degenerate into catch phrases and simplistic mnemonics.

To the extent such a danger exists it is reinforced by the scarcity of evaluation of corporate training and development (Woodling 1980). There are many problems just in defin-

ing what might be measured to assess the effectiveness of these activities—productivity, individual skills, satisfaction and self fulfillment, absence of tensions? Finding ways of measuring it presents another whole set of difficulties. At this time, evaluation appears to be limited to surveying participant response.

A substantial number of individuals reach the limit of their advancement at an age at which they, and their employers, can anticipate 20 to 30 more years of active work. . . .but it would appear that their needs have been considered only to a minor extent. . . .

Less surprising than the first is the second major characteristic of the majority of employer-sponsored programs. Most are narrowly defined, relevant to a specific task or an immediate set of circumstances, and have a well defined and limited range of use. Thus most corporate programs are at the training end of the range of parameters suggested by Branscomb and Gilmore (1975) as distinguishing training from education. This is quite understandable and, on the whole, appropriate to the purposes and priorities of the corporate sector. These programs operate under severe limitations of resources, particularly in terms of the time managers and professionals can spend on continuing development. Furthermore, industry in this country is strongly oriented—some think excessively—towards short-term profitability and the bottom line of the quarterly reports. All this is not conducive to developmental activities that, in the words of Branscomb and Gilmore, would have a "less constrained range of use even to uncertainty about specific utility."

This is an issue in need of considerable attention. Demographic projections clearly show that the "baby bulge" of the '50s has passed through its teens and well into its 20's. During coming years it will age into the 30-to-45 cohort, substantially swelling the ranks of that group. At the same time there will be a considerable reduction in the number of young people of an age at which corporations have traditionally recruited for entry-level positions and for individuals with new skills.

This means that changes in manpower needs will increasingly have to be met by retraining and continuing education of the existing labor force, and that employers must reckon with growing employment stability. It then becomes increasingly important for the employer to ensure ongoing renewal of theoretical foundations and basic understanding in addition to updating specific skills. As one corporate official noted, managerial and professional employees should be able to update their degree on a periodic basis, not only refreshing their understanding of the original content but also learning the new material added to the curriculum since their graduation.

Theoretical concepts and basic insights change with time, and keeping pace with this is important to any individual's ongoing intellectual vitality.

The need for this is evident for those who are rising on the hierarchical ladder, but it is equally important for those who will not move into the narrow point of the corporate pyramid, instead remaining at a middle-management level. A substantial number of individuals reach the limit of their advancement at an age at which they, and their employers, can anticipate 20 to 30 more years of active work. Their continuing effectiveness as well as their satisfaction with their job should be of particular importance to all employers, but it would appear that their needs have been considered only to a minor extent in the design of corporate education and training.

A third aspect of a longer range and less utilitarian approach to development would be to provide managerial and professional personnel with more than a superficial exposure to the external factors influencing their company and their work.

For example, it would seem desirable that every middle- and advanced-level manager of a large financial concern have a reasonably sophisticated understanding of the potential of modern information systems and similarly that everyone in the upper echelon of utility companies be knowledgeable about pertinent aspects of alternative energy sources. One has the impression that at this time corporate attention to this kind of information is limited to providing one-shot slide shows or lectures, or at best an afternoon's seminar. Such a limited exposure to complex subjects leaves the individual manager and executive at the mercy of the expert on whose detailed knowledge he or she then has to rely uncritically.

A broadening of corporate human development objectives to include these various longer range and less specific needs would provide considerable opportunity for cooperation with colleges and universities in designing and providing appropriate instruction. By their very nature such programs would need to include not only the pertinent professional subjects but also the liberal arts (Smith 1980).

This raises a related issue that should be included in a broader perspective on human development by corporations. Many of their professional and managerial staff will have entered employment after intensive and narrowly defined professional preparation. With time, both their interest in and their need for a broader education will increase, and it is likely that they as well as their employers would benefit from opportunities for programs in the humanities and the arts. Such activities can provide a sharpening of insights and a maturing of understanding that can be very useful on the job, in addition to enriching the individual.

A significant contribution to these broader and longer range developmental objectives can be made by making systematic use of tuition assistance programs. Educational institutions and corporations could work together to identify various instructional activities of potential interest within this broad context, and make arrangements for these to be offered at convenient times and locations.

Such programmatic developments would be most desirable. But even to achieve more modest degrees of industry/university linkage, there will have to be considerable adaptation of attitude and approach on the part of higher education.

The corporate view of the academy

If outside observers come away with a number of critical comments about the corporate training and development enterprise, they also get quite devastating views of their own academic establishment. There is pervasive criticism of the academy, and much of it is at least partially justified. These criticisms fall into a number of broad categories

Pedagogical issues. Paramount among these is the universal complaint, all too familiar and all too valid, that many students obtain baccalaureate and even master's degrees with inadequate basic skills, particularly in the area of communication. Many graduates write badly, speak badly, and listen badly, all serious handicaps to being an effective member of an organization.

Just as prevalent is the view that university and college curricula are too narrowly focused on cognitive content, with inadequate attention to behavioral and affective factors. This complaint, of course, is a direct consequence of the corporate emphasis on interpersonal relations and organizational development. Even if the corporate interest in this area is considered excessive, the academic world needs to pay serious attention to this issue.

Equally serious is the related accusation that colleges and universities are too theoretical and too abstract, with inadequate use of experiential learning through internships and other practical experiences, and with too few faculty members who themselves have been active "in the real world." Students by and large are inadequately prepared to analyze and solve complex problems to which a combination of disciplines needs to be applied; they do not know how to work as part of a team. There is great need to make these interrelated aspects a more explicit part of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum in most areas.

All of this adds up to a pervasive feeling that colleges and universities, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, provide inadequate preparation for the transition from theory to practice, and that the graduates are not employable without further training, even if they have all the vocational skills. Some of these sentiments are exaggerated: Educational institutions cannot produce "turn-key" products for a wide variety of occupations who can "hit the ground running" without any on-the-job training. But there certainly needs to be considerable movement in that direction.

Related to this criticism is the widespread impression that most college and university faculty members are unfamiliar with pedagogic methods suitable for adults, especially those who come into the classroom with a great deal of prior experience. There is too little attempt to capitalize on prior experi-

ence, inadequate movement to a more inductive teaching approach, and too little realization that most older students (and indeed perhaps all students) can learn a great deal from each other and can to a considerable extent proceed at their own pace if the faculty member becomes a facilitator and catalyst for learning rather than the sole source of information.

Attitudinal issues. Academic institutions must learn to work together with industry in defining educational needs and developing appropriate content and format. Although in recent years there has been some movement toward real cooperation, the prevalent mode continues to be that a group of faculty in splendid isolation identifies what it believes to be an external need, designs what it considers to be the best way of meeting it, and then tries to interest individual and corporate clients. That simply does not work, and is resented as an example of academic arrogance.

In making arrangements with a corporate client to provide certain programs of instruction to employees, the academic institution in effect enters into a tripartite relationship in which the individual students constitute the third apex. Part of the challenge of teaching adult and experienced individuals is that the feedback of their views and reactions to content and format must be taken seriously, and that they must be used as "evaluators of their educational experiences."

Organizational and procedural issues. The instructional needs of the corporate world are manifold, and must be met by a wide range of program formats, from occasional seminars to multi-week, full time residential programs. Some of the needs are predictable and repetitive, and can be planned well ahead of time; others arise unexpectedly and require a quick response. If academic institutions are to provide even a fraction of this broad array of educational services, they must develop considerable flexibility, adaptability, and speed in their development and delivery.

... a group of faculty in splendid isolation identifies what it believes to be an external need, designs what it considers to be the best way of meeting it, and then tries to interest individual and corporate clients.

In program design, review, and approval, colleges and universities must find a way somewhere between the traditional lengthy process and a "rubber stamp" alternative in which offerings are provided without any academic oversight. There are several possible alternatives, some of which already operate on many campuses.

Admissions and registration procedures must be streamlined and made more flexible. Most corporate programs involve neither credits nor degrees, and pose no admissions

problems at all. When there is a question of credit and matriculation, the apparent dilemma between the corporate desire to have programs open to all employees, and the institutional insistence on degree standards can be resolved quite simply by distinguishing between admission to a course and admission to degree candidacy. The latter can be made conditional on the successful completion of a few courses. Rapid and flexible registration procedures at convenient times and places should present no difficulty.

Adaptability of time, place, and format is obviously necessary but there are some limits to which the corporate clients need to be sensitive. It is also necessary to examine the relative advantages of the convenience of an on-site location with the countervailing advantages of an on-campus program with access to libraries and with mixing of students from different backgrounds and occupations. A number of corporations have found that their employees prefer the latter even at the cost of considerable extra expense and travel time.

The necessary flexibility and adaptability can be considerably enhanced by the application of educational technology. A great deal can be done by imaginative use of televised material—by cable, microwave transmissions, or physically transported video cassettes—coupled with the opportunity to question the instructor via telephone. The coming years will witness rapid development of computer-assisted and computer-managed instruction and the use of the video discs. These innovations will increase the ability of an institution to reach out to a wide variety of sites.

The flexible use of faculty is a complex issue. Corporate programs presently make only limited use of educational institutions, but rely to a considerable extent on their faculty. There seems to be no quantitative study or even estimate of this, but all signs point to a substantial use of faculty members as designers and instructors of employer-sponsored instruction, either on a direct consulting basis or as consultants to the external agencies used by the corporations. This raises a very basic and troublesome question: To what extent is this a parasitic and ultimately harmful use of the parent institutions of these faculty members? When a corporation or a consulting firm employs a faculty member on a per diem basis, it obtains the services of this individual at marginal cost and without having to pay the indirect, overhead expenses of the institution which furnishes the faculty member with a basic salary, office and research facilities, health insurance and other fringe benefits. Should there not be some corporate contribution to these expenses, just as there would be if the corporation contracted to have a research project carried out by the faculty member?

At issue here is not the time-honored privilege of faculty members to provide consulting services, but rather whether such consulting should be accompanied by some form of institutional support to offset the indirect costs. This is a delicate and emotional subject that must be explored with some caution.

There appear to be several principal reasons for the wide-

spread use of faculty consultants in corporate education. One is the recognition that, in spite of all the criticisms and complaints outlined previously, colleges and universities continue to be a major source of the new knowledge and techniques that professional and managerial employees need to absorb. The second reason, by contrast, is quite negative: It is so much simpler and quicker to turn directly to an individual faculty member than deal with his or her institution. This holds true even when the desired service consists of teaching a full course or something roughly equivalent. And when the corporation needs an amount of faculty time that doesn't fall neatly into an academic schedule—a weekend workshop or a series of six seminars, for example—it encounters additional bureaucratic obstacles, because many institutions have no mechanism for shifting workload except in full course units, and at the same time they often impose strict limitations on overload assignments.

If this assessment of the situation is valid, it would suggest an urgent need for mechanisms that would make faculty available on as flexible basis as is possible under existing consulting arrangements, while yet assuring some indirect cost return to the institution.

A possible approach would be the development of a "practice plan" similar to those medical schools use for their clinical faculty. There are many variants to such plan, but generally the institution collects fees for patient service and returns to the faculty an amount calculated on a sliding scale. This maintains a substantial incentive and reward for the faculty member while also providing support for the institution. A number of engineering schools have established centers for technical consultation on a similar basis, and such arrangements could be extended to include instructional services.

Conclusions and recommendations

The many educational linkages and relationships that currently exist between the corporate sector and the country's colleges and universities demonstrate that the many difficulties and barriers to mutually beneficial cooperation can be overcome. The success of some of these programs shows that the portion of corporate education and training currently carried out cooperatively with colleges and universities can and should be substantially expanded, and that this will be to the benefit of both partners.

The potential advantages to the educational institutions are evident at a time when the traditional college-going population is declining and colleges and universities need to scramble for new clientele. To that extent this paper and its conclusions are self-serving. But there are also important advantages for the corporate sector:

- The inherent advantages of "buying" instead of "making" as long as the buyer has an adequate measure of control over the content and format of the product. The buyer can "shop around" more freely and can adapt more

easily as needs change either quantitatively or qualitatively. In addition, stronger interaction between academic professionals and training and development professionals is likely to produce a healthy measure of reciprocal criticism with both sides learning from each other.

- The likelihood that it is ultimately more cost-effective to rely on the non-profit, tax-exempt educational system rather than to continue to develop a separate one within the profit-making, taxed sector.
- The probability that, with the exception of technical advances in the high-technology area, colleges and universities will continue to be a major source of new knowledge, and the places where new discoveries and insights are conceptualized, organized, and translated so as to make them suitable for transmission to and understanding by others.

In pursuing more partnership across the new frontier, however, one must keep in mind some basic problems of scale and location. All of the advanced management and executive training programs currently operating in colleges and universities in this country could not handle the total needs of a single large corporation, let alone the combined needs of the corporate sector. In addition, the location of many of the companies is not convenient to the principal concentrations of educational institutions, a geographic mismatch now being aggravated by the trend for companies to move to the sunbelt states. Modern telecommunications might reduce the problems both of scale and of location, but in the meantime most major corporations continue to find it easier to develop their own training system.

In order to achieve more cooperation, academic institutions need to make substantial attitudinal, pedagogic, and organization changes and for their part corporations must adjust some of their emphases and expectations. To summarize, then, colleges and universities need to:

- achieve considerably greater adaptability and speed of response in the content, time, place, and format of instruction; availability of faculty; and use of educational technology;
- recognize the importance of joint decision making in defining developmental needs and designing appropriate instructional responses;
- have faculty teach more inductively and to act more as facilitators of individual learning so as to be more effective teachers of adults;
- make greater use of experiential learning and focus more on multidisciplinary problem solving so as to narrow the gap between theory and practice;
- above all, assume greater responsibility for preparing individuals to function more effectively on the job and in society.

By the same token, it would seem appropriate and in their own ultimate interest for business and industry to move somewhat in the opposite direction, from the overly specific to the more general, and to:

- place greater emphasis on renewal and updating of theoretical foundations and basic conceptual understanding without losing sight of the immediate and specific task-oriented needs;
- provide greater opportunities for a more thorough understanding of changes in pertinent environmental factors;
- develop a clearer concept of the recurrent educational needs of a quasi-static managerial and professional group most of whom will remain at a middle level, rather than to focus primarily on the needs of those moving up the ladder;
- in general, lay greater stress on the individual's ability to think about and to understand his or her tasks.

Overarching these suggestions for changes within the educational and the corporate sector is the need for developing a strong and effective working relationship between the two. Such a relationship is becoming increasingly important for other reasons as well. With the traditional time lag between fundamental research and its application rapidly decreasing in many areas, university/industry cooperation in research is essential (National Commission on Research 1980; Brodsky *et al.* 1980; Johnson and Tornatzky 1981). Such cooperation also is crucial to a more coherent approach to the general issue of a national manpower policy (Kyle 1981), and to the training and education of the young as well as the adult (Wilson 1980). As Willard Wirtz (1977) among many others has pointed out, our institutions of work and of education must cease to think of themselves as separate and begin to realize that they are integral, coordinate, and interdependent parts of a whole.

There is urgent need to give serious thought to ways this interdependence and potential for cooperation can best be implemented. Many of its facets are interrelated: Manpower planning and development is clearly pertinent to corporate training and development needs, and in turn there are direct links between this and the research relationships between universities and industry. None can be viewed in isolation, and yet, as Wilson (1980) has quite rightly pointed out, "efforts to develop relationships between different groups fail, if their basis is only that such relationships are good." The cooperative effort must have well defined goals, lest it become diffused into generalities.

Organization theory speaks of "boundary-spanning structures" that can be part of either system or occupy some "organizational space" in between, as long as they are sufficiently articulated and have enough real authority to result in real collaboration (Johnson and Tornatzky 1981). Some boundary structures already exist. Usually there are individu-

als charged with this in both educational and in corporate organizations, and in addition many colleges and universities have formally constituted advisory boards for departments, schools, or colleges. As has been pointed out however, these boards may not provide business with a strong enough role.

Whatever the particular format and mode of operation, whether existing ones can be strengthened or new ones are needed, the development of an effective mechanism for dialogue and cooperation between the corporate and educational sectors is urgently needed. One does not need to fully accept the apocalyptic view of some observers (for example, Doll 1980) to recognize that the current situation is fraught with danger for both sectors. Business and industry are spending vast sums on training and development that is narrowly defined and designed with little external critique and evaluation. Higher education is facing severe difficulties because it is too rigid and seemingly too arrogant to adapt itself to evolving needs. It would appear that each could be of help to the other, with mutual benefit.

References

- American Management Associations. *Directory of Management Education Programs*. New York: American Management Associations, 1978.
- Barton, Paul E. *Worklife Transitions: The Learning Connection*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.
- Bentley, M.T. and Hansen, G.B. "Improving Productivity via QWL Centers." *Training and Development Journal* 34 (March 1980): 30.
- Branscomb, Lewis M. and Gilmore, Paul C. *Education in Private Industry*. *Daedalus* 104 (Winter 1975).
- Bricker's International Directory of University Development Programs. Woodside, Cal.: Samuel A. Pond, 1981.
- Brodsky, Neal H.; Kaufman, Harold G.; and Tooker, John D. *University/Industry Cooperation*. New York: Center for Science and Technology Policy, New York University, June 1980.
- Craig, Robert L. and Evers, Christine J. "Employers as Educators: The Shadow Educational System." *New Alliances: Business and Higher Education*. Edited by G. Gold and P. Tate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Denison, Edward. *Accounting for U.S. Economic Growth, 1929-1969*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1974.
- _____. "Explanation of Declining Productivity." *Brookings Bulletin*, Fall 1979. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Doll, Russel C. "Speculation on the Meaning of the Trend Toward Corporate Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 60 (January 1980).
- Goldstein, Harold. *Training and Education in Industry*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning, 1980.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Moving Beyond Productivity to Quality." *AAHE Bulletin* 33 (May 1981). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Janger, Allen R. *Matrix Organization of Complex Businesses*. Conference Board Report #763. New York: The Conference Board, 1979.
- Johnson, Elmira C. and Tornatzky, Louis G. "Academia and Industrial Innovation." *New Alliances: Business and Higher Education*. Edited by G. Gold and P. Tate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Kendrick, John. "Increasing Productivity." *Inflation and National Survival*. Edited by C. Walton. New York: New York Academy of Political Science, 1977.
- Kyle, Regina M.J. "Business, Government and Higher Education: Partners in Economic Development." *New Alliances: Business and Higher Education*. Edited by G. Gold and P. Tate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1981.
- Lusterman, Seymour. *Education in Industry*. Conference Board Report #719. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.
- McNulty, Nancy, ed. *Management Development Programs: The World's Best*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publ. Co., 1980.
- National Commission on Research. *Industry and the University*. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Research, 1980.
- Peterson, Richard E. *Lifelong Learning in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Schillinger, A. George; Kaufman, Harold G.; and Wiener, Anthony J. *Changing Roles of Universities, Industry and Government*. New Directions for Continuing Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Shaeffer, Ruth G. *Staffing Systems: Managerial and Professional Jobs*. Conference Board Report #558. New York: The Conference Board, 1972.
- Smith, G.B. *Employer-Sponsored Recurrent Education*. Palo Alto, Cal.: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, November 1980.
- Smith, Norman R. "Corporate Training and the Liberal Arts." *Phi Delta Kappan* 60 (January 1980).
- _____. "Stable Employment: A \$5.7 Billion Saving." *Engineering News* 202 (June 1979).
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin*, January 1981.
- Wilson, James W. *Models for Collaboration: Developing Work-Education Ties*. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Training and Development, 1980.
- Wirtz, Willard. *The Boundless Resource*. Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Institute (now the National Institute for Work and Learning), 1977.
- _____. *Tuition Aid Revisited*. Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Institute (now the National Institute for Work and Learning), 1979.
- Woodington, Donald. "Some Impressions of the Evaluation of Training in Industry." *Phi Delta Kappan* 60 (January 1980).

Partnerships in Continuing Education For Professionals

Philip N. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern

Professional associations are conducting a growing number of education programs for their members, with and without the aid of colleges and universities. Collaboration offers considerable payoffs—and pitfalls.

Background—Milton R. Stern

Partnership is one of those words that can encourage pleasant thoughts of compatible collaboration. But unless such partnership is worked at realistically, more often than not the era of good feeling will not survive any better than in any other kind of partnership. Handshakes, written agreements, or marriage vows mean little in the absence of good will and trust. Dr. Nowlen and I agree that there is enough cheerful possibility in this particular subject—relations with professionals and their societies—that we can discuss it with some optimism. Let me hasten to add, however, that he is more cheerful than I. When I think of the possibility of universities and professional societies working together, I'm reminded of Mahatma Gandhi's reply when he was asked his opinion of western civilization. Said he, "I think it would be a very good idea."

A word about our format: It is not one of debate but we will try to be somewhat contrapuntal. Also, we thought we would try to separate out description of the activity from that of the problems that must be met. It is in that latter discussion that we disagree.

Our discussion will cover just one segment of existing and possible relations with professional groups. Historically, for centuries there have been interlocking, even incestuous, involvements between professionals and universities. But a new dimension has been introduced in the past 30 or so years—continuing professional education. That will be our limited subject. We aim to be suitably modest, aware that continuing professional education is new territory for everybody; we will try to tell you what we know about it, but I assure you that we'll seek to avoid being experts, in the sense of the definition you may have heard: "An expert is a person who avoids small errors as he swoops down upon the grand fallacy." I'm sure that if we do so swoop, someone will let us know.

Although we won't cover in depth the ages-long relation of professions with the university, I should like to touch upon it

briefly as background to the new opportunities of continuing professional education.

The basic function of the medieval university was to train the bureaucratic and technological cadres that the society of that time thought it needed. The arts graduates (or at least some of them, for attrition was high in the universities of medieval Europe) went into the fields of law, medicine, or the church, and took higher degrees in same. The idea of professional development was the first inspiration of instruction in universities.

Take the example of Bologna, the earliest university, founded essentially as a law school. Indeed, most of the Italian student universities of the 12th century were created largely in response to the need for the development of civil law in the newly merging city states of northern Italy. Roman law had to be updated and new law created for new situations. It must be noted today in 1981 as we consider what is thought to be a new field of continuing education that the very establishment of that first university at Bologna was the creation of adults. The earliest universities didn't begin with young people crowding around a group of benign elders clamoring "Teach us, teach us!" Those elders themselves were not prepared to teach—in fact, they were the students. For it was a group of mature men, older people, who organized themselves into what has become the university, the jewel in the crown of western education.

That realization gives body to a condition that otherwise may seem merely quaint: the student governance of those earliest institutions. (Parenthetically, it may remind us that today's professionals, as Dr. Nowlen will point out, require a different approach than do undergraduates—they are peers

Philip M. Nowlen is director of Center for Continuing Education at the University of Chicago. Milton R. Stern is dean of University Extension at the University of California, Berkeley. They presented this paper at the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C.

and there are both curricular and instructional implications that are not always considered by university teachers.) The students were not youngsters waiting to be socialized but already established and mature men, who, in the facts of life of those times, needed to protect themselves against the citizens of the cities in which they were studying. Town and gown was more than fun and games in the 12th and 13th centuries. These students joined together, made the rules, and they hired their instructors, who, in due course, also formed themselves into a self-protecting guild of masters. The University of Bologna prospered and, when plague and pox didn't intervene, had as many as 10,000 students. But the real disaster came about 200 years after its founding when the masters and doctors sought to perpetuate their control, having by then, with a bit of assistance from successive popes and local rulers, taken control away from the students. They did this via a time-honored guild device: They established the limiting condition that the right to teach law at Bologna could be passed on only through blood relationship, that is, through the sons and nephews of the guild of masters. Fortunately, before the university expired as a result, the rule was changed.

Perhaps this points up how close a parallel there is between professions and trade unions, which until recently in our own country frequently maintained the same sort of provision. There is little doubt that professors and plumbers think alike about their self-interest. Also the story raises the matter of defining a profession, a vexatious problem. Dr. Nowlen and I have agreed that whatever else may be included, continuing education must be part of the definition. Cyril Houle in *Continuing Learning in the Professions*, the first comparative approach to the subject and most valuable, offers this definition:

The needs of society require that every professionalizing occupation become better than it is, and at least part of the effort it must exert is the improvement of its patterns of lifelong learning. A dynamic concept of professionalization offers educators both the opportunity and the challenge to use active principles of learning to help achieve the basic aims of the group with which they work. (p. 30)

Note that Houle's definition gives us—educators—house-room. He does not assume, as members of professions themselves so often do, that they are the only ones who can develop appropriate instruction. But then Dr. Houle is a member of our own guild. So there will be room for dispute, as you will discover, if you haven't yet done so, when you talk to professionals.

The scope of professional education— Milton R. Stern

Let's come back to the present. Without question, continuing professional education is a large and growing activity. In the past two or three decades it has become the most important of all continuing education programs in terms both of dollars

and of enrollments—through professional societies themselves; private enterprise marketing for profit; the in-service programs of business and industry; community colleges; the armed forces and other federal, state, and local government agencies; continuing education arms of universities; and the professional schools of universities. This, I think, is an inclusive classification of all kinds of providers, if we list the private professor who goes into business independently. Really, anyone who wants to set up a course of instruction can do so, but practically speaking, the providers fall into the classifications I've indicated. Most of them, where applicable, seek to use members of the professoriate in roles of curriculum development and of instruction. Probably a large proportion of the professoriate has taught for one or more of the type of organizations that I've listed. If we include business management as a professional field, such continuing professional education has to be the major part of this post-tertiary education. True, it may include some work toward degrees—the MBA, for instance, may be so classified, as may certain advanced engineering degrees—but most of all it comprises nondegree related instruction.

As to present impact on faculties, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (December 1, 1980) showed professors' earnings beyond their salaries—money from both in and outside universities—to be rather important. The most heavily rewarded groups, as you might suppose, were full professors of business and engineering. The former averaged 39 percent over their base salaries with average outside income of \$11,517; the latter, the engineers, 34.4 percent, with outside income amounting to \$10,091. A great deal of that extra earning came from continuing professional education post-tertiary teaching: whether for extension arms or professional schools in their own institutions or moonlighting in others, or for professional societies, or private enterprises, or on contract directly with large and medium-sized business and industrial firms. Instruction and consulting are kissing-kin. The "one-day-a-week" consulting tradition is helpful to faculty but it does tend to put the self-interest of such professionals ahead of institutional loyalties. We will have more to say on that topic at a later point.

The universities are probably bypassed these days as providers by the professional societies. I say probably because of the absence of accurate information. The National Center for Education Statistics has not yet caught up with the fact that millions of men and women are involved as students; that scores of thousands of people, faculty and others, are involved as teachers; that several billion dollars are being spent, earned, distributed as a consequence of this activity. However, we can get at the size of the audience by reference to a few scattered statistics. For example, we know that in Illinois, Dr. Nowlen's state, more than half a million people are required to take continuing education programs to retain their professional licenses; in my state, California, the number is well over a million. These include all kinds of professionals and professionalizing occupations. They include professionals

who have bases in schools of universities and many who do not.

As many of you are aware, the matter of relicensure at the state level, along with the growing requirements of professional societies for maintenance of certification, are the prime incentives for the development of continuing professional education. Let us take one profession, accounting. Some 37 states presently require the continuing education of accountants, typically in a pattern of 120 clock hours of instruction in a three-year period, although California requires 80 hours within a two-year period. Licensing boards in accountancy in these states supervise the continuing education of accountants. It is in truth *compulsory adult education*.

Practically speaking, the major part of university continuing education could be people whom the universities themselves have educated—people who may be regarded as lifelong members of the university.

How many accountants are affected? As well as can be discovered by Rex Cruse, director of continuing professional education for the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, there are something like 225,000 certified public accountants in the United States. (And if even that tidy profession cannot be sure of how many they add up to, it's no wonder that other statistics remain somewhat inaccessible.) You may ask, "Who teaches those accountants?" By and large, their own state and local societies, with only occasional assistance, intervention, or participation of universities or community colleges. Increasingly, there has been a trend toward self-directed education, modified correspondence or tape instruction, or education conducted within the large accounting firms themselves.

The dollar volume, what one can see of it, is interesting. The AICPA itself is currently budgeting more than nine million dollars a year for continuing professional education both in and out, that is, on the expense side and on the income side. This does not mean that the Gross National Accounting Product, if you like, stops there. Much of what the AICPA does is to provide professional materials for use by other providers. This means, in most cases, state societies and local accounting organizations although a recent study showed something like 23 percent is provided by universities and colleges.

Now let's go to medicine for a recent federal growth statistic. In 1975, there were 377,500 active physicians (medical and osteopathic). In 1990, there will be 596,800, we're told, a growth of 58.1 percent in 15 years. The number of women physicians is expected to double—to 100,000. This report by the Department of Health and Human Services also gives other information useful in planning continuing education pro-

grams. While there will be a substantial increase in U.S.-trained doctors—and therefore less need to develop crash programs in English as a second language for foreign-born health professionals as is the case now—there also will be a shift in specialty choice from non-primary care to family practice. But, an important point, it is expected that a significant percentage of physicians trained in primary care will eventually choose non-primary care practice. Obviously, to do that they will need continuing education on a large scale. About the only way the university may get a look-in at this activity is if the medical school works out the arrangement to provide needed instruction at the low fees that doctors expect to pay.

Speaking to the idea of partnership, with medicine the question remains: Will the university become a provider with a professional society? I have to answer with another question: Did you ever try to work with the American Medical Association or a state medical association?

Dr. Nowlen will deal in detail with the mixed attitude toward cooperation with universities on the part of various professional societies. So, let me wind up this section by re-emphasizing that in addition to the admirable fact that professionals keep on learning because they are professionals, it is also true that society, through government, has given them a big push in that direction by the striking recent phenomenon of relicensure on a periodic basis. I mentioned this earlier, but it deserves more than passing comment. This bureaucratic intervention sometimes offends the professionals who regard their societies, in some cases at least—notably in the health sciences—as entirely capable. But, it is really the compulsory requirements of the recent past that have brought about the growth of continuing professional education.

The 1980 census may give us some sense of the number of working professionals in the country. I can only speculate at this point: We do know that as of a year ago, there were more than 13 million people with bachelor's degrees plus another 9.2 million more who had had five years or more of higher education—something over 22 million total. We may assume that this is a basic pool, with a few million more in emerging professionalizing occupational fields in technological and health service areas, from which we can add up the number of working professionals. With various deductions for age, motherhood, probably there are upwards of 15 million so classifiable.

In effect, these people never graduate: To maintain their status as professionals they must keep coming back to school. They could be ours, in universities, but are they? As a group they are more important to the economic and educational conception of a university than the much more modest number of adults seeking to return to obtain undergraduate degrees. Typically when reference is made to adult students, the population described is that latter group. Practically speaking, the major part of university continuing education could be people whom the universities themselves have educated—people who may be regarded as *lifelong members of the university*.

So much for this introduction and brief comment on the scope of the opportunity for partnership with professional societies. If I tend, somewhat sourly, to think of it as an unsurmountable opportunity, I will now cede to someone far more cheerful than I.

Providers of professional education— Philip N. Nowlen

Most powerful and persuasive among the providers of professional continuing education are the professional associations, universities, employers, and a variety of agencies in the business of continuing education for profit. Their involvement in continuing education may be direct, indirect, or both; by indirect, I mean providing the resources of various kinds—mailing lists, audio-visual support systems, financial support, and the like. Let me just briefly highlight some of the operations of two of these providers, the associations and the universities.

Professional associations. As organizational units, professional associations are quite complex, even volatile. Continuing education programming units may be found in local chapters particularly in large metropolitan centers, at the state level, and in the national office. Sometimes the respective responsibilities for programming at these different levels are carefully distinguished—the American Bar Association, AICPA, real estate brokers, and the American Medical Association, for example. This is not the case with other associations, such as those for hospital management, the allied health professions, local government officials, and corporate personnel officers.

For any given field, there is also the question of the representativeness of its professional associations. AAHE, for example, may represent its members quite successfully in several aspects of their higher education responsibilities, but many of its members have other dimensions to their positions, represented by other associations. The issue of representativeness is just one of the factors in play in nursing, for example, where fractionalization continues to be a way to insure that the speciality and sub-specialty nurses are represented—but by smaller and smaller organizational units, leading to a diminution of influence on those larger issues that affect nursing as a whole.

This is a way of saying that associations, no matter the size of their permanent staff, are highly political. Educational priorities may shift dramatically as new board members succeed those whose terms have ended. The attitudes of association leaders also may differ dramatically from state to state, whether the issue is collaboration, accreditation, or mandatory continuing education.

A recent survey of continuing education directors in professional associations found that the respondents had held their position an average of slightly less than three years. Associations that had had a full-time education director

for ten years had employed an average of four individuals in that post.

Most of these education directors are quite sophisticated in the discipline their association represents, according to the survey, but are scarcely aware that there is a coherent field of study and research called adult education that might be of direct assistance to them. They have few if any staff except at the national level, although notable exceptions are the associations for engineers, accountants, pharmacists, and medical doctors. Their budgets are minimal and their programs, after breaking even, are expected to contribute to the general revenue of the organization.

At any gathering of professional associations, then, you will find a spectrum of association attitudes, policies, and undertakings reflecting:

- recent discovery of continuing education and the potential for assuring higher professional accomplishment and increasing association revenues at the same time;
- discontent with the pace of progress, the cost of program development, the measurability of results, and the levels of quality of individual programs;
- attempts to provide members with a measure of quality control through mechanisms such as association accreditation of individual programs or providers;
- efforts to improve the organization of association programs and increase the volume of program offerings;
- assertion of sole-provider status for the association, usually through refusal to accredit any offering not sponsored or co-sponsored by the association;
- active collaboration with other providers, including universities and other associations.

Getting acquainted with the association leadership of your state and region is one way to begin to assess the opportunities and risks of collaboration. If you find antagonism from osteopaths, architects, or optometrists, try auditors, systems analysts, and social workers. But go back to the osteopaths, architects, and optometrists in two years—policies and staff change frequently.

Universities. In the universities, individual professional schools provide most of the traditional instruction related to an occupation-distinct knowledge base. There is little collaboration among professional schools as providers of continuing education. Yet as Houle points out, in such fields as patient care collaboration of a fairly close sort seems reasonable. Even in the many instances where individual professional-school program development is completely appropriate, many institutions overlook the substantial economies of scale available through centralizing support systems such as market research, mailing list acquisition, and maintenance and computerization of certain administrative functions. This places each professional school at an unnecessary administrative disadvantage.

Most universities have extension, continuing education, or

community service divisions uniquely placed to lead or encourage appropriate levels of cooperation among professional schools. Such cross-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary, and multi-disciplinary efforts succeed in addressing the knotty issues faced by practitioners—issues that do not often correspond to academic departmental structures. Extension and continuing education also can provide a more coherent brokerage function for the institution's resources; otherwise, just the time spent by association leaders being transferred again and again by the university switchboard would be a major discouragement.

It's probably fair to say that most colleges and universities really have no accurate institution-wide measure of the level of involvement in continuing education for the professions. It is so variously financed that there is no auditable track for thousands of hours of non-credit instruction. Under such circumstances there is little opportunity to set goals and priorities consonant with institutional mission and planning. This is a policy vacuum at best. At worst, it results in policies, such as those covering faculty participation in and compensation for continuing professional education, that strongly induce faculty to offer their services to the other providers—associations, employers, and those in the for-profit business of continuing education.

Professional education programs— Philip N. Nowlen

Education programs for professionals are extremely varied and no three persons agree on terms such as seminar, course, conference, workshop, institute, and so on. One way of distinguishing among these programs is by learning modes:

- Inquiry or problem solving—resulting in a new synthesis, policy, or strategy.
- Traditional instruction—resulting in enlarging or strengthening capabilities.
- Performance—specifically aimed at generating some practice or modifying or withdrawing something from habitual practice.

Programs also can be distinguished by their range:

- The individual professional—renewing or expanding the individual's knowledge and skill in the narrow and precise discipline associated with his or her occupation; for example, orthodonture. Or addressing barriers to effective practice outside this formal discipline; for example, time management, interpersonal skills.
- The individual professional in the micro practice environment—for example, personnel management or budget forecasting for newly appointed nursing supervisors; negotiation skills; team building.
- Groups of professionals in the micro setting—for example, new developments in financial software for bankers; establishing reasonable performance standards for hospital-based social workers; improving peer review processes.

tal-based social workers; improving peer review processes.

- Groups of professionals in the macro setting—for example, analyses of public policy issues such as professional accountability, consumer protection, and professional advertising; or interpreting new legislation or the impact of new litigation.

Finally, programs can be distinguished by their methodology:

- Traditional campus courses—for example, for those who have an MBA specialized in accounting and now need an equivalent preparation in marketing or finance.
- Short, intensive residential programs, some on campus but many at hotels or specially equipped conference centers
- Audio or video cassette courses, often supplemented by reading lists
- Partially mediated instruction, such as a statewide bar association conference in which some presenters appear before groups in major population areas while lawyers in smaller towns and isolated areas watch on closed circuit or cable TV and interact by telephone.

This classification may be useful in helping colleges and universities identify appropriate roles as providers. For example, a liberal arts college might offer an open-forum inquiry for professionals in a particular field, exploring issues of public accountability, and hosting the meeting at a civic conference center.

Encouragement and caution—Philip M. Nowlen

The great variety of types of educational programs for professionals should offer encouragement to higher education institutions to explore this territory. Nevertheless, significant problems experienced with past programs require that both parties approach the matter with some caution. Both Dr. Stern and I would like to offer our own perspectives on the situation.

On the encouraging side are the results of a study of association/university collaboration efforts. The 1979 study included 110 professional associations and 136 universities (a rate of return of 44 percent and 56 percent, respectively). Of the respondents, 48 percent of the associations and 85 percent of the universities had undertaken collaborative programming. Of the associations *without* collaborative programs with universities, 31 percent had attempted collaboration: half of these were still in the planning stage; the other half were discouraged by lack of time and staff. Of the associations without collaborative arrangements or efforts in this direction, 50 percent simply did all their own programming; only 10 percent said they had been "burned" in a previous effort and were reluctant to try it again.

Of the associations *with* collaborative programs, 75 per-

cent considered them successful, 17 percent were unsure, and 8 percent considered them unsuccessful.

What were the major problems encountered in the collaborative venture? Among the associations, 48 percent reported turf definition problems, who was responsible for what; 36 percent found the university hierarchy too complex for effective decision making; 25 percent said that university business procedures were inadequate—"they could never tell us what anything cost"; and 10 percent stated that unprofessional faculty behavior was at fault—"arrived late, cancelled lectures, patronized the learners." For their part, 43 percent of the universities also reported problems with defining turf and dividing labor; 36 percent said they had difficulties with dorm accommodations not being appropriate for the program participants; and 26 percent found that costs were higher than anticipated.

The survey also asked which, if any, of the problems would inhibit collaboration in the future. Of the associations, 15 percent noted turf problems, 13 percent university decision-making complexity, and 10 percent unprofessional faculty behavior. Of the universities, 19 percent said inappropriate housing, 17 percent turf problems, and 17 percent unexpectedly high costs.

On the favorable side, associations thought they had benefited more financially than the universities from the relationship. But the universities felt they had benefited more than the associations. The chief benefits, according to the associations, were an improved association program (90 percent), a greater awareness of university capabilities (79 percent), improved professional competence (70 percent), and the generation of collegiality between association and university personnel at various levels (70 percent).

The universities found the chief benefits of collaboration to include strengthened awareness of university capabilities (88 percent), the collegiality generated (88 percent), improvement in the quality of the association program (85 percent), and the fact that as a result of this experience one or more additional professional groups approached the university to explore cooperation (83 percent).

Despite these encouraging findings, there are also a number of factors that work to deter collaboration. For example, university policies on faculty participation in continuing education generally do not require faculty involvement "in load," but restrictive compensation rules provide little incentive for extra teaching service. As a result, faculty find they can augment their income by making individual deals directly with the professional associations and, in so doing, set no internal waves in motion. For the same reason, it is easier for universities in the same city to employ one another's faculty in continuing professional education. The net effect of such policies is loss of the institutions' potential role in continuing professional education and the strengthening of other providers instead.

In addition, university business practices—especially the turnaround time on reporting interdepartmental charges, pay-

ing honoraria, refunding registration fees, and the like—make life especially frustrating for associations.

For the university's part, problems such as accreditation make collaboration both frustrating and costly. Accreditation criteria vary widely from state to state, as do the requirements of state-mandated continuing education. The fees for accrediting reviews of each program or provider seem to rise each year. And, some associations assume the accrediting role while maintaining a provider role, raising questions of conflict of interest and restraint of trade. The professions and universities are of many opinions on issues such as mandatory continuing education, relicensure through testing, and regulation for accountability.

These conflicts and problems areas cannot be overlooked. Nevertheless, when the factors discouraging collaboration are subtracted from those supporting it, I can still advise even the most isolated four-year college that it can have an appropriate role to play in continuing education for the professions and can find associations anxious to collaborate.

. . . restrictive [university] compensation rules provide little incentive for extra teaching service. As a result, faculty find they can augment their income by making individual deals directly with the professional associations. . . . The net effect. . . is loss of the institution's potential role in continuing professional education. . .

Encouragement and caution—Milton R. Stern

As I follow Dr. Nowlen's presentation of strengths and weaknesses, encouragements and cautions, I find myself compelled to the imperative mood: universities *must* seek to develop programmatic arrangements with professional societies wherever possible. Unless we do, the structure and the reputation of universities will be seriously damaged, and within the next generation, I must give added weight to some of the points that Dr. Nowlen has made.

On the positive side, it is true, university prestige still remains an abiding strength and one that must be kept in mind constantly in negotiation with professional societies. Higher education still commands immense respect, not only in the whole society, but with professionals who by and large are the product of universities. A major weakness, paradoxically, is the university's strength, its major capital asset—the faculty, which stands in danger these days of being dissipated both as an institutional and as a social resource.

The universities, I repeat, should undertake continuing professional education with professional societies, because it is an assertion of academic and social responsibility. To do this, thousands, tens of thousands, one doesn't know how many faculty members must be brought to book—or, to put it

another way, faculties as a whole must assert their corporate strength against those who already have taken long steps away from collegial standards. Faculty members in the applied disciplines are involved in continuing professional education in the same way they are in consulting—not in their institutional personae, but as individuals. Classicists and historians may utter jeremiads at the wandering scholars from engineering and management or chemistry or public health but most of these colleagues are out of earshot psychologically.

The problem is one of academic discipline, discipline in the corrective sense, or, of self-discipline by faculty members who so often seem to equate academic freedom with the opportunity to obtain large fees outside their institutions. They say they do it because they are not paid enough inside, and if that's the case, one can only argue that collegiality would call for a mutual deposit fund to protect the whole faculty, Sanskrit scholars as well as management specialists. This is extremely unlikely in the modern state of American mores as a whole and of academic mores today. There is a schism between humanities and the applied disciplines on this matter, but in a much more serious sense, I believe, there is a gap between faculties and universities. This argues a kind of schizophrenia if we accept that faculty members are, as they proclaim so frequently, the university. It is a most confused picture.

Getting at it by parallels, think of the current example of the discussion about whether or not universities, notably the great research universities, should or should not go into the genetic engineering business, the better to develop and exploit the research of faculty members in several related fields. You will remember, I'm sure, that Harvard just a couple of months ago decided after much anguish not to do so.

The debate was mixed. Not only were some passionate voices raised from the more remote areas of the humanities to the effect that free research and free enterprise don't mix, but some of the passion may indeed have been self-centered. Take for example the comment by Nobel Laureate Walter Gilbert, professor of molecular biology at Harvard. When the *Crimson* asked him what he thought Harvard's decision should be, Professor Gilbert said, "The University should keep a great distance between research and technological development."

Professor Gilbert's solemn warning would appear to be either academically innocent or disingenuous in the extreme. According to the Harvard alumni magazine, he himself is president of Biogen, a multi-million dollar Swiss-based firm engaged in the development of genetic engineering, specializing in interferon.

This dazzling developmental area is full of the new academic millionaires, where Berkeley graduate students, as their firms go public, become worth 25 or 26 million dollars overnight. Without that torrent of dollars, the gold-rush attitude is also true of continuing professional education. For faculty, that is. You may be interested to know that we can't

get anybody around the Stanford or Berkeley campuses to do anything like a lecture on the field of genetic engineering. They're in business for themselves. The professor as professional chemist, engineer, manager, or, if you like, the professor as professional professor, these days appears to have limited loyalty to his or her institution. How can one talk of partnership with such an attitude rampant?

So far, these representatives of the professoriate seem to take the position that academic freedom includes the right to make a buck from what is developed by them in the laboratories. And as they consider continuing professional education, it includes the right to make their own arrangements for teaching their peers outside the academy. The *Wall Street Journal* (January 20, 1981) reported the complaints of management students at Northwestern who felt that the outside interests of their teachers cut into their responsibilities to their students. The story said that the graduate students "who pay \$6,300 a year in tuition are particularly galled when what they call 'the green flu' causes a professor to miss class." Police and firefighters have the blue flu and professors get the green flu.

I may be accused, of course, of a vested interest because I find it difficult to negotiate with individual professors on my campus, and it's quite true that I do. The standard attitude of professors in the applied disciplines was expressed in a recent faculty committee meeting. They raised the question in terms of "What is the appropriate faculty return on gross income that is derived from a continuing education course?"

That was their question, and they give their own answer frequently enough by raising their sights. Just last month, we asked two professors in a technological field they commanded, and in which they certainly had developed new data,

... Inevitably a marked change in academic lifestyle will grow out of the division between the heavy-money earners of the professional applied disciplines on one hand and the new poor among the humanities and arts faculties on the other. This is becoming more and more pronounced in our accelerating inflation.

to teach a two-day short course. For 12 hours of teaching they asked \$9,000—\$4,500 each for 12 hours of teaching—no bargaining. I regard that as extreme, but I think I can understand it in terms of the general tone of contemporary morality—"I'm O.K. Jack." This has to be faced as an institutional failure. If the professional deformation of faculty is greed, the professional deformation of administration in universities is timidity, indifference, and an unwillingness to govern in the interest of the whole. This I perceive to be the larger danger.

There are positive things to do. First, in developing partnerships with professional associations universities must recapture the professionals as faculty members: There are upwardly mobile professional societies that have no base in universities, and these very well may be more interested in seeking a prestigious university connection. But those with professional university connections will not be available to us unless the university can redirect the loyalties of its own faculty-based professionals, not, to be sure, away from their societies, but in parallel terms, once again, back to the university.

I have said before that the university as an institution has no independent policy and no independent set of practical guidelines in continuing professional education. When I use the word "independent" I mean that it has left the task to professional faculty members who are, in turn, members of interlocking directorates of licensing boards and of the leadership of professional societies simultaneously. If this goes on, if universities or the whole faculty do not exert some sort of regulatory control, we will never achieve any kind of satisfactory relationship with professional societies.

I do think it will go on, and my pessimism extends to the belief that, given this indifferent attitude on the part of universities, inevitably a marked change in academic lifestyle will grow out of the division between the heavy-money earners of the professional applied disciplines on one hand and the new poor among the humanities and arts faculties on the other. This is becoming more and more pronounced in our accelerating inflation. A combinatorial discipline can be exercised by mutual consent, by understanding on the part of the whole faculty, who are the only resource of the university, if they are energetically and imaginatively led.

The imperative is that the university must relate to professional societies in the provision of continuing education. There is no law or tradition that can preserve the omnibus universities of America if schismatic faculty break it in two. Would (will) professionals and their societies lose by taking over from universities and moving even more monopolistically into the new territory of continuing professional education? Yes, decisively. The later education of professionals obviously can benefit from the leavening influence of other parts of higher education. The professional societies will lose if they do not cooperate because the public, which regards all professions these days with utmost suspicion, would incline to even more regulative and punitive behavior if the university connection were dropped.

On the university side, it must assert its own authority to live up to the image the public still holds of it as surrogate for the whole society in assuring breadth, vision, and humanity. Thus, at the end, I come as a political realist to an encouraging conclusion—one, however, that I must affirm can only come about if based on a stoic ethic on both sides: Out of necessity, universities and professional societies will work together. I hope sooner, rather than later, in the interests of all of us.

References

- Health Resources Administration. *The Current and Future Supply of Physicians and Physician Specialists*. Washington, D.C.: Health Resources Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1980. Pub. No. HRA 8060.
- Houle, Cyril. *Continuing Learning in the Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Nowlen, Philip, and Hohmann, Lillian. *Collaboration Between Universities and Professional Associations*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979.

Current Issues in Higher Education

Copies of the 1980 and 1981 *Current Issues in Higher Education* are available individually or in sets, at the prices shown below. Bulk discounts are available. To prices listed add 15% postage/handling charge. All orders under \$15 must be prepaid. Make checks payable to AAHE and mail to AAHE Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036; 202/293-6440.

1981 Series—Complete set \$15.

1. **High School/College Partnerships (\$3.50)** • High School/College Partnerships That Work—Ernest L. Boyer • High School/College Cooperative Programs—Michael O'Keefe • Humanities for the High Schools—Gale K. Crouse • Building a High School-to-College English Curriculum: The Queens English Project—Janet R. Brown • Quality and Equality in the High School Curriculum: A College Board Study—George H. Hanford.
2. **Creating an Integrated Curriculum—The 'Higher' in Higher Education (\$3.50)** • What Is 'Higher' About Higher Education?—Harlan Cleveland • Curricular Integration: Mortar for the Ivory Tower—Mary Jim Josephs • Integrative General Education: The 'Saint Joseph's Model'—John Nichols • An Integrative Program for Building Skills: The City and The Self—Susan Gurewitsch
3. **Partnerships with Business and the Professions (\$3.50)** • New Frontiers for Higher Education: Business and the Professions—K. Patricia Cross • A Role for Colleges in Corporate Training and Development—Ernest A. Lynton • Partnerships in Continuing Education for Professionals—Philip A. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern
4. **Part-Time Faculty in Colleges and Universities (\$3.50)** • Overview—Thomas A. Emmet • Who Are the Part-Timers and What Are Colleges Doing for Them?—Howard P. Tuckman and Barbara H. Tuckman • The Legal Position of Part-Timers—John Andes • Faculty Development For Part-Timers—Richard Bagwell and Ione Elioff
5. **New Technologies for Higher Education (\$3.50)** • Overview—Raymond J. Lewis, Jr. • What Makes A Telecourse?—Rodger A. Pool • Curriculum Issues in Telecommunications—Adele F. Seeff • Administration Issues in Telecommunications—Marlowe Froke • Adapting to the Computer Revolution—John H. Strange

1980 Series—Complete set \$15

1. **Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality (\$3.50)** • When Does A College Deserve To Be Called "High Quality"?—Alexander W. Astin • Measuring the Quality of Student Effort—C. Robert Pace • Commentary on Pace—Mark Curtis • The Changing Roles and Priorities of Academic Advising—Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes • Teaching Improvement Strategies: How Effective Are They?—Robert J. Menges • Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target?—Robert T. Blackburn, Glen Pellino, Alice Boberg, and Colman O'Connell • What Are the Obstacles to Improving Quality Teaching?—Hans O. Mauksch
2. **Funding Quality Improvement: Lessons from the FIPSE Experience—Charles I. Bunting** • Commentary on Bunting—Charles Bingman, Sol Pelavin, Kenneth W. Tolo • Proliferation and Agency Effectiveness in Accreditation: An Institutional Bill of Rights—H. R. Kells • Commentary on Kells—Robert L. Ketter, William H. Knisely, Kenneth E. Young (\$3.50)
3. **Differing Perspectives on Declining Faculty Salaries (\$2.50)** • How Well Are Faculty Paid? Implications of the Academic Reward Structure—Kristine E. Dillon and Robert H. Linnell • The Economic Decline of the Professoriate in the 80's: What Happened to Faculty Salaries and What Are the Implications?—Peggy Heim
4. **New Models for General Education (\$2.50)** • General Education for a Contemporary Context—Jerry G. Gaff • Quality and the Campus: The High School/College Connection—Ernest L. Boyer • Curricular Priorities for the 80's: Beyond Retrenchment—John C. Sawhill
5. **Integrating Adult Development Theory with Higher Education Practice (\$2.50)** • Adult Development: A Workable Vision for Higher Education—Arthur W. Chickering • Faculty and Student Development in the 80's: Renewing the Community of Scholars—L. Lee Knefelkamp
6. **Strategies for Retrenchment: National, State, Institutional (\$3.50)** • Basing Public Policy on Student Achievement: A New Agenda Item—Francis Keppel • Commentary on Keppel—Willard L. Boyd, Alice J. Irby, Elizabeth H. Johnson, Thurston E. Manning • New Roles for the States in Monitoring Higher Education Quality—Carl Kaysen and the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education—The Management of Universities of Constant or Decreasing Size—Richard M. Cyert